

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
 FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 GREENVILLE DIVISION

Gena Garrison,)	Civil Action No.: 6:16-307-MGL
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Integrity Funding Ohio, LLC, and Jason)	
Adams,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On February 1, 2016, Plaintiff Gena Garrison, (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this employment discrimination action construed as pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101, *et seq.* In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for all pretrial handling. On June 28, 2016, following briefing by the parties, the Magistrate Judge prepared and submitted a Report and Recommendation, (The Report), (ECF No. 34), recommending that Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint as against Defendant Jason Adams, (ECF No. 28), be granted. Objections to the Report were due by July 15, 2016. Plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report, and the matter is now ripe for review by this Court.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Applying the above standards to the instant matter, the Court has carefully reviewed the record, applicable law, and the Magistrate Judge’s Report, (ECF No. 34), and finding no clear error in the Report, the Court adopts and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, Defendants’ partial Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 28), is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff’s Complaint is dismissed as against Defendant Jason Adams.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

July 18, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina